



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

analysis and the confidence which he places in the results. Because of the large number of readers who will not discriminate, one can but feel that what is generally conceded should be more sharply distinguished from personal opinion and from what is widely questioned. Jülicher's "Introduction," though less popular in character, will none the less be more serviceable, even to the general reader. There is much in von Soden's book that is stimulating and suggestive, but oftentimes it is difficult to recognize the reasonableness or advantage of his hypotheses. For instance, if the Epistle to the Ephesians has such near relationship to Paul, why not make the connection a little closer? Or again cannot most of the objections based on internal grounds, and many of those on external, still be urged against this hypothesis of a double of the apostle John? Other questions of a like import will suggest themselves to the thoughtful reader.

WARREN J. MOULTON

BANGOR, ME.

SOME RECENT WORKS ON PAUL AND PAULINISM

The half-dozen books which are to be considered in this article cover a pretty wide field. Nägeli's¹ pamphlet of 100 pages is an introductory characterization of the Pauline vocabulary. It makes abundant references to the inscriptions and papyrus fragments discovered in recent years. The author regards the *κοινή* as a natural development from the classical Greek, a connecting link between that and the new language. The letters attributed to Paul share throughout the character of the *κοινή*. The apostle was uninfluenced by the literary theories of his day. His vocabulary is not only largely post-classical, but it bears another mark of the *κοινή*, viz., its giving new meanings to old words. This vocabulary represents both grades of the *κοινή*, its more select diction being found in I Corinthians, Philippians, and Romans; its more common forms, in Galatians and Philemon.

Nägeli suggests, and with force, that too much has been said of Hebraisms in Paul's writings. Most of the expressions thus denominated are from the LXX, and are to be attributed to the influence of this Greek version rather than to a Semitic mode of thought on Paul's part.

In regard to the bearing of the lexical argument on the question of genuineness the view of Nägeli is cautious and moderate. He finds the four chief letters bound together by vocabulary and mode of expression.

¹ *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus.* Von Theodor Nägeli. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905. 100 pages. M. 2.80.

They take us directly into the sphere of the non-literary *κοινή*. The lexical character of II Thessalonians is rather for than against its genuineness. So also with Ephesians. But in the case of the Pastoral Letters the language is thought to weigh somewhat heavily against their genuineness. This pamphlet leads one to hope that the author's plan to publish a Pauline lexicon which shall consider the significance of every word, its relation to the LXX, to classic and late Greek, and especially to the *κοινή*, may be realized.

From the lexical point of view, according to Nägeli, the four chief letters of Paul belong together and constitute a homogeneous literary monument. Between this result and that at which Professor Völter,² of Amsterdam, arrives the difference is great. For this scholar is convinced that these four letters are not a homogeneous monument, and did not originate in one mind. Of Romans about seven-sixteenths are regarded as genuine, the same amount is ascribed to an interpolator, and the remainder is regarded as late additions. Galatians entire is given to the man who revised Romans. About three-quarters of I Corinthians is considered to be the work of Paul. Of the first nine chapters of II Corinthians (the last four chapters constitute a letter by themselves) a little more than one-half is interpolated. The genuine letter to the Philippians was about one-quarter the size of the canonical epistle. The interpolations in Romans include most of chapters 1-4 and 7-9, those in I Corinthians include the famous chapter on love, and those in Philippians include the passage on the humiliation of Christ and the intensely personal third chapter.

The elaboration of the above positions constitutes a volume of 331 pages. It is not possible in this article, nor is it necessary, to follow the analysis at great length in order to form a fair judgment of its quality and of the force of its ultimate conclusions. We will consider two or three characteristic passages. Chapter 2:6-16 of I Corinthians is said to disturb the connection and not to be in harmony with either the preceding or the following verses. Two arguments are advanced in support of this view. It is said, in the first place, that Paul had spoken "wisdom" to the Corinthians in 1:17 f., while 2:6 implies that he had *not* thus spoken to them. But that depends upon what Paul meant here by "wisdom." If he meant "the word of the cross" in its simplest form, then 2:6 does not appear to be in line with the preceding chapter. But we see no reason why the "wisdom" of 2:6 should be thus limited. The word of the cross may be presented as "milk" (3:2), or it may be presented as "meat," as

² *Paulus und seine Briefe*. Von Daniel Völter. Strassburg, 1905. 331 pages. M. 7.

wisdom for spiritual Christians. Again, it is said in favor of regarding 2:6-16 as an interpolation that 3:1 seems to follow immediately on 2:5. In both places Paul is speaking of his appearance in Corinth, and the same introductory words are used. But these statements have no independent force as against the originality of the intervening verses. We have no right to assume that even an apostle will always write in such a manner that no verse can be removed without destroying the sense of what is left. Finally, it is urged that the thoughts of 2:6-16 are mainly borrowed from the Wisdom of Solomon. But while certain general resemblances are to be seen, the characteristic thought of the Corinthian passage in regard to our knowing the mind of God (vs. 11) has no parallel in the Wisdom of Solomon.

Or take the grounds on which I Cor., chap. 13, is taken away from Paul. Chapter 12:31a speaks of "greater gifts" which ought to be desired, and we expect some description of these, but do not find it until we reach 14:2. Meantime chap. 13 goes beyond chaps. 12 and 14. Its author put a lower estimate on spiritual gifts than either the Corinthians or Paul himself. Chapter 14 has absolutely no sense after chap 13. Therefore chap. 13 can not have stood originally between chaps. 12 and 14. Chapter 12:31b and 14:1 were put in to make the interpolation of chap. 13 smooth.

The author of chap. 13 was a Greek, in high position, whom without doubt Greek motives influenced; to whom, however, the Christian spirit gave the genuine impulse (*Schwung*) and the right word.

Now, the critical leverage in this case seems to be quite inadequate. Granted that Paul's words in 12:31a lead us to expect some description of the "greater gifts," we cannot dictate at what exact point such a description shall be given. The gift of chap. 13 rises, it is true, above the gifts of prophecy and speaking with tongues, but that fact of itself is plainly no reason why the chapter should be taken from Paul. The same man may have a lofty spiritual ideal of character and yet attach some value to physical agencies. We may well regard chap. 13 as preparing the way for a correct estimate of the gifts which chap. 14 discusses.

From Völter's treatment of Galatians a single point in further illustration of his method. He takes 1:12 as claiming that Paul received his entire gospel by a revelation from Jesus Christ, and, rightly rejecting such a view, affirms that his gospel had a historical basis. But the fifteenth verse of the same chapter indicates that our author's reading of the twelfth verse is wrong. The fifteenth verse affirms that God revealed his Son in Paul, and this furnishes an adequate explanation of vs. 12.

The revelation of Christ in him meant a revolution in his thought of Christ. This was fundamental, but it did not relieve Paul of the necessity of learning as others did about the earthly life and teaching of Jesus.

These specimens of the author's method must suffice. It seems to be altogether arbitrary and inconclusive. Oftentimes the difficulties against which the critic's arguments are leveled have no real existence.

A very real difficulty, however, confronts us when, e. g., we attempt to regard our letter to the Romans as a document addressed to the church at Rome soon after the time of Nero, nearly half of which came from a man whose views were not a little different from those of the apostle. What became of the original letter? Is it not strange that it disappeared entirely? Is it probable that a thoroughly revised and modified form of an apostolic letter should find at once universal acceptance? If there was some disciple of Paul whose influence at Rome so overshadowed that of the great martyr-apostle that his revision of the apostle's letter crowded the original out of circulation, is it not a little remarkable that tradition has preserved no trace of him? And the same sort of difficulty has to be met in connection with Völter's analysis of I Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians. Paul was the master-mind of his generation, the most widely known, the most inspiring. Therefore a hypothesis which requires us to believe that his letters were radically revised by some of his disciples, and that as thus revised they were everywhere accepted in the place of the autographs, must marshal a more formidable array of arguments than have as yet been discovered and brought together.

By the side of Professor Völter's book that which we are now to consider,³ is in strongest contrast. In the first third of his large volume (528 pages), which discusses the documents, the author accepts as genuine writings of Paul not merely Romans, Galatians, I and II Corinthians, but also II Thessalonians, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles; that is to say, thirteen letters. He also accepts the Lucan authorship not merely of the diary, but of the entire Book of Acts. The survey of this field does not profess to be exhaustive. It deals chiefly with the most recent arguments for and against Paul's authorship. The survey, however, is broad and the treatment forcible. The second third of the book deals with Paul's testimony in relation to the gospels, and the last third with his testimony in relation to the life of the church. This section does not appear to form an integral part of the general theme, though some readers may find it the most interesting part of the entire volume.

³ *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ.* By R. S. Knowling, New York: Scribners, 1905. 531 pages. \$3.

The author divides Paul's letters into four groups. The first includes the Thessalonian letters and Galatians; the second, Corinthians and Romans; the third, the letters of the first imprisonment; and the last, the Pastoral Epistles. It is plain that, in the author's view, the vital part of Paul's testimony to Christ is testimony to his Godhead. He finds this in the earliest group of letters, and virtually in a complete form. "We may well ask," he says, "whether any Christology and soteriology can really go beyond that which meets us in this earliest group of epistles" (p. 48). But it is noticeable that he goes to the *second* group of letters for an explanation of the Galatian passage: "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." It is said that the clause, "God sent forth his Son," must clearly be interpreted in relation to such passages as Rom. 8:3, 32. But the second of these passages does not employ the words to be explained, and the first does not throw any light on their use in Galatians. The author, in harmony with such early theologians as Athanasius, regards the words "his own Son" as signifying a participation by the Son in the essential nature of the Father (p. 46). In the fact that the language (Rom. 8:32) is like that which describes Abraham's relation to the sacrifice of his son "we may see in an incidental, but in a very distinct, manner how St. Paul recognized the identity of nature between God and him who is called by the apostle 'God's own Son'" (p. 47). This is like Chrysostom's argument that because Jesus said to Peter, "Thou art Simon, son of Jonas," and Peter said to Jesus, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," therefore Jesus was Son of God in the same sense in which Peter was son of Jonas.

Dr. Knowling thinks (p. 66) that the testimony to Christ in the second group of letters (Corinthians, Romans) goes beyond that of the first group in the clearness of its affirmation of pre-existence. He refers especially to I Cor. 8:6, to the clause "through whom are all things," but nowhere seeks to show that his interpretation of this is the only tenable one.

The christological doctrine which the author finds in the epistles of Paul is that of the Nicene theologians. His exegesis is far more cautious than theirs, and his christological passages are fewer, but it seems not unfair to say that in him as in them one perceives the influence of ecclesiastical tradition. It appears unfortunate that only one side of Paul's testimony to Christ should be given, and the other side, which is fuller and more explicit, should be passed in silence. It is surely a mistake to think that we can explain Gal. 4:4 by Rom. 8:3, ignoring such words as Acts 13:38; I Cor. 11:3; 15:28; and Eph. 4:5, 6.

In regard to matters of fact and in statements of evidence, apart now

from christological passages, the language of our author is sometimes open to criticism. Thus, e. g., he considers it certain that Eutychus was dead. He refers to Luke's statement in Acts 20:9. He does not, however, allude to the fact that Paul in the next verse says: "Make ye no ado; for his life is in him." We surely cannot at once assume that these words mean: "Make ye no ado; for he is now *restored* to life." Again, having said (p. 279) that Jeremiah had used the phrase "a new covenant," the author adds that "every Israelite was looking forward to that covenant with eager hope." But was there ever a time in the history of Israel when that was even remotely true? It is said of Paul (p. 354) that after his first visit to Jerusalem subsequent to his conversion he went to Tarsus "to spend many years in his native town." But of such inaccuracies these cases may suffice, and our survey of the book may be concluded with reference to a statement in which we fully agree with the author. Although he exalts the service and teaching of Paul, he declares that it is "unintelligible to speak of Paul as if he was the founder of Christianity," or as "the second founder of Christianity." One who claims that Paul founded Christianity must, we should suppose, identify Christianity with theology, and even then the statement would need qualification.

We have now to notice more briefly three other German works. Emil Weber⁴ writes a monograph of 152 pages to maintain that Romans, chaps. 1-3, are to be fully understood only from the standpoint of the missionary. They were born out of missionary experience, and enable us to form an idea of the kind of preaching with which Paul introduced his gospel to the gentiles. They are not regarded as being at all a reproduction of one or more missionary addresses, but rather as indicating in a summary manner the lines of approach which the missionary had followed. Rom. 2:17-29 gives in substance a scene out of Paul's experience with the Jews, and shows how he was in the habit of meeting the objections which they brought against him. From this point the author proceeds to a study of the first chapter and the third. It is held that Paul's picture of the development of sin and its resultant moral degradation was not based on Genesis, but on his missionary experience.

Johann Walter,⁵ pastor, as he tells us in his *Vorwort*, of a parish of some 24,000 souls in Livland, discusses the Christianity of Paul, or a

⁴ *Die Beziehungen von Rom. 1-3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus.* Von Emil Weber. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1905. 152 pages. M. 2.40.

⁵ *Der religiöse Gehalt des Galaterbriefes.* Von Johann Walter. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1904. 257 pages. M. 6.

section of it. The method is psychological in this sense that the author proceeds from his own experience of Christianity to find out the Christianity of Paul, assuming, of course, that real Christianity is always the same; the avowed purpose of the undertaking is religious—the purifying and deepening of present religious life. The book, though in form of a commentary, discusses the course of thought rather than the separate words—discusses it broadly, with logical and analytical power, but not, conspicuously, with power of compact, and clear statement. The author's conclusions, though independently reached, are in general agreement with such works as the late editions of Meyer.

The second letter to the Corinthians, which, by the way, is regarded as a single letter, is interpreted by Langheinrich⁶ from the point of view of pastoral theology. This discussion first appeared some eighteen years ago, and appears now in a second edition, which, the author says, differs little from the first. If the book had to do with critical questions, this confession would make a somewhat unfavorable impression, but it has not. It keeps close to the practical value of Paul's example and word for the Christian pastor of the present day. It is characterized throughout by a general and elevated spirit and by good practical sense. We cannot do better than close this article with a few words of Langheinrich to the preacher of the twentieth century:

Your sermon must breathe the certainty of victory. It must not be a discouraged apology, or a weak mediation made up of dominant conceptions of the day. It must be a decided witness of the salvation of Christ on the basis of a fact which is both objectively and subjectively present. This is apostolic preaching.

GEORGE H. GILBERT

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

THE SACRAMENTS IN THE EARLY CHURCH

These monographs¹ are both suggested by the interesting treatises of Wilhelm Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu* and *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*. They both controvert the conclusions defended by Heitmüller, though from somewhat different historical and critical points of view. Andersen—as against the opinion of Heitmüller, that Paul's doctrine of the Lord's Supper

⁶ *Der zweite Brief Sankt Pauli an die Korinther.* Von Friedrich Langheinrich. Leipzig: Janas, 1905. 223 pages. M. 3.60.

¹ *Das Abendmahl in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christus.* Von Axel Andersen. Zweite Ausgabe, Giessen: Töpelmann, 1906. 111 pages. M. 2.

Die Taufe im Urchristentum im Lichte der neueren Forschungen. Von F. M. Rendtorff. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905. 55 pages. M. 1.20.